

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed April 16, 2009. With the addition of claims 26-30, claims 8-10, 13, 18 and 23-30 are presented herewith for consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has indicated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed 02/06/2008 fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2) because a copy of each cited foreign patent document was not provided. Submitted herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement resubmitting the foreign patent document including a copy of the Abstract of the foreign patent document.

Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) because they do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the phrase “the peripheral device... that is directly operationally connected to no other device” in claim 25 is alleged not to be shown in the drawings. This language has been canceled from claim 25, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 13, 8-10, 18 and 23-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13, 8-10, 18 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,231,399 to Meng (hereinafter “Meng”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,142,833 to Zhu et al. (hereinafter “Zhu”). Applicants note that Zhu appears only to form the basis for the rejection of claim 23. As such, applicants treat the rejection of claims 8-10, 13, 18 and 24-25 as being based on Meng alone. Applicants treat the rejection of claim 23 as being based on the combination of Meng and Zhu.

Independent claim 13, and claims 8-10, 18 and 23-25 dependent thereon, have been amended to recite a system board “fitting within a system enclosure for enclosing the system board,” and that the system board having:

a connector that includes:

- (i) a first port situated at an outermost exterior boundary of the system board and facing outward from said outermost exterior boundary, said first port open to an exterior of the system enclosure for accepting a peripheral device from outside the system enclosure, and
- (ii) a second port facing inward to an interior of the system board and system enclosure.

These features are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Meng. Meng relates solely to the insertion of daughterboards into motherboard card slots. As would be understood by one of skill in the art, daughterboards include a variety of exposed electronics, and the insertion of daughterboards into card slots in Meng occurs entirely within a system enclosure in which the motherboard resides. While the card slots may face oppositely to each other in Meng, the card slots are still positioned within the interior of the enclosure to receive daughterboards that are entirely contained within the enclosure.

By contrast, the connector of the present invention is provided to be mounted on the system board in such a way so that a first port of the connector is open to an exterior of the system enclosure. In this way, the first port is able to accept a peripheral device from outside the enclosure, such as for example a portable flash memory device which may be conveniently inserted into and removed from the first port from outside the enclosure. The second port faces into the interior of the system enclosure for accepting a peripheral device within the system enclosure. The feature of a first port open to the exterior of the enclosure for accepting a peripheral device from outside the enclosure is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Meng.

The Examiner notes that Meng states, “changes may be made in detail, especially in the matters of shape size and arrangement of parts within the principles of the invention” (col. 3, lines 3-5). However, this statement, by itself, is not enough guidance to the skilled artisan to modify Meng to the invention recited in the claims as amended. The mere statement that a disclosed device may be modified does not give sufficient guidance as to how to modify the device of Meng to that of the present invention. There must additionally be some guidance or common sense suggestion which would lead the skilled artisan to make the modification to Meng that would result in the present invention. Meng, by itself, does not have such guidance nor would it be obvious to modify Meng to the present invention without some additional guidance from the prior art. Moreover, applicants

respectfully submit that any such changes to Meng would be limited to affixing of cards within a system enclosure, given that Meng relates entirely to connection of daughterboards. As indicated above, a skilled artisan would understand that the connection of daughterboards to a motherboard takes place entirely within a system enclosure in which the motherboard is located.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13, 8-10, 18 and 24-25 are patentable over Meng, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 13, 8-10, 18 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng in view of Zhu. As indicated above, claim 23 is dependent on claim 13. Claim 13 recites features which are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Meng. Namely, claim 13 recites a first port facing an exterior of the system enclosure for accepting a peripheral device from outside the enclosure. Zhu adds nothing to the teaching of Meng in this regard. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 23 is patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 26-30 are added herewith. Independent claim 26 is patentable over the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above. Namely, claim 26 recites a port open to an exterior of the system enclosure. No new matter has been added.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 8-10, 13, 18 and 23-25, and consideration of claims 26-30, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2009

By: /Brian I. Marcus/
Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665